

The Revolutionary Age

MAY 1921

A Chronicle and Interpretation of Events in Europe

Vol. I, No. 5

Saturday, November 30, 1918

Price, 3 Cents

The Crisis and the Socialist Party

THE international situation is becoming more suggestive, more potential of great success or infinite disaster. And events are moving swiftly; the history of a day is now equivalent to the history of tens of normal years.

The European proletariat is preparing itself for the final struggle against Capitalism and Imperialism. The proletariat in Russia has conquered definitely; the proletariat in Germany and Austria is on the verge of conquering all power for the revolutionary dictatorship of Socialism. But the class struggle within any one nation inevitably produces reactions in other nations; and while Socialism is conquering in Russia and Germany, the sinister forces of international Imperialism are proposing—and preparing—an attack upon the Socialist nations by means of intervention.

These intervention proposals constitute a problem of the utmost gravity, and a call to consistent, aggressive action by Socialism and the proletariat in all nations.

The coming of peace is a time of great dangers. The forces of Imperialism sharpen their appetite sharpened by victory, and they resort to all sorts of schemes whereby they may impose an imperialistic peace, which is a camouflage of democracy. They are fighting against the revolution in Russia, and in Germany, against the movement for a peace that not only would destroy the great hopes aroused by the coming of Socialism in those two nations, but that would carry within itself the threat of new wars. Victory produces a tendency toward reaction, inevitably; and this tendency might conceivably be strong enough to impose its will upon the peace conference. When the war ceased, the real struggle started; and instead of peace being a call to "taking things easy," it is a call to action.

In and through all these problems runs the red thread of the great issue between Socialism and Capitalism.

Already, reaction is shaping itself here. The Mooney case is a challenge, and the vicious insult of "clemency" is a new challenge to the proletariat. Reactionary peace terms are being proposed, the campaign for larger armaments is acquiring enormous proportions. Action is developing against Socialism and independent proletarian activity. The coming industrial crisis will disarrange industry and cause enormous unemployment. The coming year or two will bring the mightiest strikes and industrial struggles in the history of this country. And through it all runs the red thread of the emerging final struggle between Socialism and Capitalism.

It is necessary in this crisis to study every peculiar alignment of the great struggle, national and international, to adapt our aspirations to immediate activity, developing reserves for the final conquest of power. . . . In this crisis, the Socialist Party, as represented by its national administration, is not measuring to the opportunity.

We must, moreover, get down to the fact that the industrial proletariat is the basis of Socialist action; that the shops, the mills and the mines are the centres of proletarian activity. We must impress upon the workers that their control of industry constitutes their real power, that they must speak in the aggressive accents of industrial might. Out of the mass strikes of the proletariat, carrying a political object, emerges the power of the proletariat, that class power which alone annihilates Capitalism.

It is necessary that we study the alignment of

forces in the labor movement, that we secure a concentration of the radical forces. The great requirement is the unity of Socialism and proletarian force upon a common platform and policy against Capitalism.

The problems are enormous, the requirements severe; it is a situation that tests the energy and the initiative, the intelligence and the audacity of Socialism. . . . But the Socialist Party, as a party, is silent, inert.

Never, in the experience of our movement, has a greater opportunity offered itself; never could a concentration of forces and a real struggle against Capitalism develop more than at this moment.

Instinctively, locals and individual members of the Socialist Party are reacting to the great opportunity. But they are scattered; there is no unity of action or purpose, no centralization of the activity of the party.

A Call for a Party Convention

Resolution adopted by the Central Committee of Local Boston, Socialist Party, November 26, 1918:

The revolutionary crisis in Europe, the campaign of the imperialistic press for armed intervention in the sea, and for armed intervention in Germany and Austria, should Socialism conquer, projects a crisis in the movement of the American proletariat.

The international situation is a call to action—the final struggle is coming between Socialism and Capitalism.

In this great crisis, it is imperative that the Socialist Party prepare itself, that it unify itself, that it formulate a policy expressing the requirements of the crisis and the mature judgment of the membership.

Be it therefore resolved, That the Central Committee of Local Boston, Socialist Party, favor an immediate emergency National Convention of the Party, and calls upon other locals to act in this

Mighty currents of ideas and of action are pulsing through the party, the germinal sap of new ideals producing a new life. But the party, as expressed through its national administration, is not, it must bitterly be confessed, measuring to the opportunity. The party, as a party, is not unified, vocal, definite.

Never, in the history of the world, have more momentous events developed than during the past two months. The crash of thrones and of Capitalism, the coming of peace with all its hopes and fears, the development of revolutionary Socialism in action, the emergence of the international class struggle between Socialism and Capitalism,—these are unprecedented historical events, the realization in life of the concepts of Socialism. Two months,—in which hours represented years, in which every minute issued a call to international Socialism—and our National Executive Committee has been silent, inert.

It is tragic. It is symptomatic of the imperative necessity of the concentration of forces within our own party as a preliminary to the concentration of the general forces of the proletariat.

The Socialist Party is pulsing with life and new ideals. But there is no focus; there is not the necessary concentration in a unified policy.

The great task before our party is a task of education and of interpretation, of intensive propaganda on a national basis, clear and co-ordinated. This co-ordination can be secured only through the national administration, but the administration is silent and inactive on these momentous issues.

The Socialist movements in France, Italy and Great Britain, are vocal, having formulated a general

policy; which is still a policy, whether one agrees with it or not. Clarity and the formulation of a clear program is an absolute necessity at this moment; but our party is laggard in this vital matter. Events at any moment may precipitate the convocation of an international Socialist Congress; what sort of Congress shall our party participate in and what shall be its proposals?

It is not sufficient to say that our delegates would represent us; these delegates should have definite instruction; and at this moment, these are lacking. Nor is it sufficient to leave this vital matter to the National Executive Committee; its attitude during the past two epochal months demonstrates its lack of initiative and energy. *The membership must speak.*

The Socialist Party resolution on the war, adopted at St. Louis in April, 1917, is no longer a policy since the coming of peace. It is now an historic document, which, in spite of many defects, is a credit to the party and which has linked up our party with the radical minority in the Socialist movement of France and Great Britain, and with the splendid Socialist Party of Italy. It is now necessary to supplement this document, to formulate the implications of the class policy it expresses in a new program.

An emergency Convention of the Socialist Party is the only body that can adequately express the attitude of the membership on the momentous events that are at present shaping the destiny of the generations to come. No machinery now at the disposal of the movement is qualified to act at this moment. The spokesmen of the Socialist Party must be elected by the members, elected for the sole purpose of speaking upon the specific issues of the crisis through which the world is now passing. No time should be lost in calling together such a body: An emergency convention should be summoned immediately.

The National Executive Committee, at its coming session, will probably issue a declaration on the international situation. That is not enough; the problems before our party go much deeper, the requirements are broader, than the mere issuance of a declaration. Should the National Executive Committee have issued the party's declaration on the war, instead of the St. Louis Convention, the declaration would not have expressed the will of the membership, would not have been vital, aggressive, historic.

The problems that this convention would discuss are fundamental. There is the problem of an international policy, of a national campaign of education and interpretation of events in Europe, of a campaign against the sinister proposals for intervention, of the coming epoch of great industrial strikes, of unifying the party upon the basis of a definite, unambiguous program of international Socialism, of reconstructing the party organizations ravaged by the persecutions of the war.

The European Socialist movements have held regular conventions during the war; our party has not since the American declaration of war. The European movement has held, is holding, conventions to discuss problems of policy and action; our party should do the same.

An emergency national convention would accelerate the development of the party, would place the party upon its feet, would concentrate the energy and action of the party locals, would prepare the Socialist Party to concentrate the awakening forces of the proletariat. An emergency national convention is necessary; it would prove an historic event, the first chapter in a new book to be written by the Socialist Party.

The Revolutionary Age

A Chronicle and Interpretation of Events in Europe.

LOUIS C. FRANKA Editor

EDMOND MACALPINE Associate Editor

Contributing Editors

SCOTT NEARING

JOHN REEF

N. I. HODRICH

LUDWIG LORE

SEN KATAYAMA

G. WEINSTEIN

ISSUED EVERY WEDNESDAY AND SATURDAY

By Local Boston, Socialist Party
88 1/2 Washington St., Boston, Mass.

Saturday, November 30, 1918

Clemency is for the Guilty!

THE "clemency" to Tom Mooney granted by Governor Stephens of California is an insult and a disgrace. It should rally labor to a new determination. In commuting the sentence of Mooney to life imprisonment, Gov. Stephens speaks about "the impossible tenets of the anarchists, whose sympathy for the German cause is well known," and that after the bomb explosion "a number of persons of pronounced anarchistic tendencies were arrested." This is contemptible camouflage. It is an appeal to the lowest passions of the mob, a perversion of the truth, and a gross indecency unworthy of the chief executive of a great state. Why clemency? And what is the clemency comprised in being sentenced to a living death for the rest of one's life? Mooney himself has asked—either acquittal or death! The struggle is a struggle for a new trial, the struggle is whether labor shall allow capital to murder an agitator who threatened the infamous profits of capital. This "clemency" should be a branch through which must pour the indignation of the American people. This "clemency," disgraceful and indecent as it is, is still the direct result of working class pressure. Let the pressure increase until Mooney again becomes free! The Seattle labor unions have adopted the right course in their declaration that the "clemency" of Governor Stephens will not alter their plans for a strike of protest.

They are Still There!

THE other day, Senator King of Utah introduced a resolution proposing recognition by the United States and the Allies of a de facto government of Russia in harmony with Allied aims.

A de facto government means a government that is actually in power. What government is actually in power in Russia? The Soviet Government, indisputably, which has maintained and strengthened itself during the past thirteen months, and whose authority is disputed only by a few counter-revolutionists—and Senator King.

But perhaps by de facto government Senator King means one of the many "governments" organized in Russia behind the screen of alien bayonets. About a dozen of these have organized—and disappeared. The most ambitious and imposing of them all was the Omsk "All-Russian Government." When Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs Tchicherin proposed an armistice to the Allies the American press—which always knows the right thing to do even when the government itself is in doubt—declared that the proposal should be made to the Omsk Government. But now this particular government no longer exists, having been overthrown by Admiral Kolchak, who proclaimed himself dictator. The Allies refuse to negotiate with the Soviet Government because it is not a government and lacks stability—in spite of having had power for thirteen months; but it is proposed that the Soviets negotiate with a government so strong, so authoritative, so based upon the will of the people, that one counter-revolutionary adventurer can overthrow it?

Would Senator King recognize the dictatorship of Admiral Kolchak as a de facto government in accord with Allied aims? This would mean to recognize the worst reactionary and infamous elements in Russian life, since Admiral Kolchak is a notorious renegade of the former Czar.

The resolution of Senator King, moreover, recommends joint military aid to overthrow the Bolshevik government and assist the Russian people in establishing an "orderly government."

Order—over whom, by whom, and in the interests of whom? Military assistance—from what "Russian people"? Such as Admiral Kolchak? Alien troops have been in Archangel and Vladivostok for some time; the Russian people as a mass have given no indication of being willing to

assist these troops. In Vladivostok the Allies dispersed the Soviet, and a new election was held: the Bolsheviks won an overwhelming victory. But their administration was dispersed. Is this the sort of assistance that Senator King has in mind? The mass of the Russian people are loyal to the Soviet Government. . . . Alien troops are still in Archangel and Vladivostok!

Bakhmetieff—and Money

Upon the overthrow of the Czar, the Milyukov-Guchkov government appointed Boris Bakhmetieff as its ambassador at Washington. He remained ambassador during the government changes, being retained by Kerensky. Upon the assumption of power by the Soviets, Ambassador Boris was dismissed, but he refused to recognize this government and his dismissal; he retained possession of the Russian Embassy in Washington, and of all funds. Since then, Ambassador Bakhmetieff has maintained relations with the United States government and carried on an anti-Soviet propaganda. Apparently, he has unlimited money. This fact suggests a number of questions. What function does Bakhmetieff perform which requires money, since he no longer represents Russia? What check is there upon the expenditure of this money? Where does the money come from? Is this money being granted him by the United States Government direct, or is it coming out of credits to the old Russian government? If the latter, who is to repay this money? What is the purpose of maintaining de facto diplomatic relations with an Ambassador who has been dismissed and represents no one but himself? What is Bakhmetieff doing these days?

All Power to the Soviets!

THE crisis of power is developing in Germany.

It is a crisis that cannot be postponed, but must definitely be disposed of, since it goes to the heart of the problems of the Revolution, determining whether Germany shall emerge into a parliamentary democratic republic, as in France, or into a Socialist Republic, as in Russia.

At a meeting of "heads of the various German states" it was decided unanimously that a Constituent Assembly should be held, and held immediately. This bourgeois Federal Conference urged that "unity" be maintained and all separatist movements discouraged, in spite of the fact that separatism is a bourgeois movement to avoid a Socialist Republic and annihilate the Revolution, as in Russia. "The proposal for a speedy summoning of the National Assembly meets general approbation," the Conference declared. The bourgeois liberals and the more sinister forces skulking behind their democratic screen, are united in favor of an immediate National Assembly. The Constituent Assembly constitutes the necessary class policy of the capitalist class.

As is natural, the majority Socialists of the Social Democratic Party of Ebert, Scheidemann & Co. are at one with the bourgeois liberals in the demand for a Constituent Assembly, and immediately at that. Their whole policy is a bourgeois policy, mobilizing the masses for the bourgeois reaction. Their concepts of Socialism, their morale and activity are the most dangerous counter-revolutionary force, since they camouflage reaction in the colors of Socialism. Scheidemann and "Vorwarts" are actively campaigning for the Constituent Assembly, attacking the revolutionary Socialists. Scheidemann's whole "revolutionary" activity seems to be engaged in proving that there are no technical objections to an immediate convention of the Assembly. A splendid Socialist task! He argues that a Socialist state cannot be established at a time of "disorder"—and this is characteristic, petty bourgeois Socialism conceiving revolution as "disorder" instead of as a dynamic opportunity to establish Socialism. One year ago the Social Democratic Party "purged" itself of "the Marxist scholastic." That was characteristic. Its "Socialism" was and is simply a decoy of the bourgeois liberals to betray the masses. And that Scheidemann is opposed to the Revolution is proven by his declaration of opposition to a class parliament such as the Workmen's and Soldiers' Council. In his love for the bourgeois, the Junker, the class of the oppressors of labor whom he yearns to see represented in a "democratic" government, Scheidemann forgets that governments are necessarily class governments, either bourgeois or Socialist, and that the requirement of the moment in Germany is the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat as an instrument for the introduction of Socialism. The assembly means the victory of the bourgeois republic and Capitalism; a "liberal" Capitalism perhaps, but still Capitalism.

The Independent Socialists do not oppose the Assembly, but they oppose its immediate convocation. Faithful to their moderate policy, they want certain reforms to be introduced which the Assembly would be compelled to ratify as accomplished facts. Hugo Haase's attitude is comprised in the declaration that "the most vital interests of the proletariat demand that the ground gained by the revolution must first be fortified securely while the proletariat still has the power to do so." But Haase wants the Assembly to convene,—with the proviso that it must not convene before the prisoners of war return and can vote! This is petty, hesitant, wavering between the government and the Councils, between proletarian dictatorship and bourgeois Assembly.

The revolutionary Socialists of the Spartacus Group, on the contrary, are categorically opposed to the Assembly, since it is an instrument of bourgeois democracy and necessarily counter-revolutionary. Their program is the dictatorship of the Socialist proletariat, the annihilation of the democracy of Capitalism as a necessary preliminary to the coming of the communist democracy of Socialism.

The issue is fundamental, and not technical. It is the issue comprised in the problem of whether power should be vested in Socialism or in Capitalism—that is the issue, in spite of wavering, hesitation and compromise. Should the program of the Spartacus Group meet defeat, it would mean the defeat of the German revolution as a proletarian and Socialist revolution. This issue of the crisis and problem of power will come to a head at the Congress of Councils which convenes December 16.

Accordingly, the revolutionary problem of the moment in Germany is "All power to the Councils!" as it was "All power to the Soviets!" in Russia. The program is identical, the crisis of power in Germany the same as that crisis which produced the proletarian revolution in Russia.

What is comprised in the slogan, All power to the Councils, or Soviets, of Workmen?

All power to the Soviets is the necessary demand of the proletarian revolution, its accomplishment alone would mean the success of the Revolution.

The Soviets, or Councils, are class organizations, characteristic of the proletarian revolution. They are mass organizations of the proletariat, the dynamic expression of the proletariat in action. A Workmen's Soviet bases itself directly upon the workers in the factories, the working class its constituency. Each factory, each shop, each mill and other industrial establishments elect delegates proportionately to the Soviet, making the Soviet the executive organ of the organized producers.

The Soviet, or Council of Workmen, first developed in its present form during the Russian Revolution of 1905, and acquired definite character during the Revolution of 1917. But the germinal forms of the institution are older, an instinctive expression of the revolutionary proletariat. During the French Revolution, when the masses acted against the hesitancy and treachery of the bourgeois National Assembly, the masses developed as their instruments of revolutionary action, particularly in Paris, the "sections" and the Commune. These were mass organizations of the workers, not based upon factories because of insufficient industrial development, but comparable in purpose to the Soviet, since they were mass organizations unified by a class policy against the bourgeoisie and the state. The Paris Commune of 1871 was a further development, since besides being an instrument of revolutionary action, it constituted itself an instrument of revolutionary government, dispensing with the bourgeois state, its parliamentary forms and bureaucratic machinery. The instinctive action of the proletariat during a revolution is to form its own class organizations independent of the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois state.

When the masses break loose in revolutionary action, they must organize,—unless they break apart and are dispersed. The old organizations and the old machinery are fetters upon the masses, activity, not comprehensive enough, and the masses often must act against these organizations; out of these needs develops the characteristic organization of the proletarian revolution—the Soviet. A dispatch the other day indicated the revolutionary significance of the Soviet in Germany: "It seems that the uncurbed agitation for Soviets among soldiers and sailors behind the actual front developed the revolutionary spirit that finally broke loose in the overthrow of Wilhelm Hohenzollern."

But if the revolution is a real proletarian revolution,

ation, the Soviets after the accomplishment of their initial task, do not disappear, but acquire new strength and develop new actions, merging revolutionary functions, developing from instruments of revolutionary action into organs of revolutionary government.

A revolution is not stable, the moment it becomes general, the revolution must extend into all spheres of life, must completely alter the political and economic complexion of society. Unless this is done the revolution becomes weakened, exhausted, and reaction comes. Until the revolution is parliamentary government, until the revolution does, only through the Soviets can the revolution develop and conquer all power.

Consider two aspects of the revolutionary situation in Germany.

The autocracy was overthrown, a "revolutionary" government organized which acts together with the Soviets, now under moderate domination, the old parliamentary forms but the description and oppression of the masses is retained. The revolution has changed the personnel of the state but not the state itself, has annihilated the old personnel of the state but not the state itself; and the proletarian revolution has not conquered until this annihilation is accomplished.

How has the revolution fundamentally penetrated the army; just as Dr. Holt and Dr. Kautsky speak in the name of the "revolutionary" government, the old officers are still at the head of the "revolutionary" army. The army should be completely disbanded, and in its place a Soviet army organized, the military Red Guard of the Revolutionary masses, since the industrial and military might of the proletariat alone can defend and extend the conquests of the Revolution. The arming of the masses is necessary in Germany to crush the counter-revolution, to crush militarism, Capitalism, and reaction.

These are indispensable phases of the proletarian revolution, neither of which are, as yet, phases of a proletarian revolution in Germany. And they are, equally, phases of all power to the Soviets, all power to the revolutionary proletarian, all power to Socialism, in Germany as in Russia.

All power to the Soviets means that Germany unquestionably and definitely initiates the coming of Socialism. Instead of a bourgeois parliamentary republic, a Socialist proletarian republic, it means the complete destruction of the old state machinery, the division of functions between legislative and executive, the parliamentary forms of bourgeois democracy, the organs of the judiciary, the army of bureaucratic officials necessarily hostile to the masses and to any radical measures the government might introduce; these are instruments of class rule. Necessary functions of government would be usurped by the Soviets, the producers. It would mean, in short, the annihilation of the old political state, organ of class rule, the machinery for the oppression of the workers, the central expression of the tyranny of Capitalism. The new state of the Soviets would be a state based upon the organized producers in the factory and the farm, representing exclusively the masses of producers. The Soviet state would recognize no other class but the working class, would exclude the bourgeoisie from participation in the government. Having organized a new state after depriving all power to the Soviets, the new Socialist government would proceed to the industrial expropriation of capital, placing industry in the control of the working class organized in the Soviets, introducing the relations of the full and free democracy of Socialism.

All power to the Soviets would constitute a revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat, a dictatorship in relation to the bourgeoisie and a democracy in relation to the proletariat. It would be a temporary dictatorship, necessary until Capitalism had been completely expropriated economically and politically, after which the dictatorship would disappear because its functions would no longer be necessary.

By means of all power to the Soviets, to the Councils of Workmen and Soldiers, and by this means alone, can the proletarian revolution in Germany conquer all power for Socialism.

A CORRECTION

Owing to an error, the article in our third issue, "The Coming of the Final Struggle," was wrongly credited to Gregory Weinstein. It should have been credited to H. I. Hourwich.

Bolsheviki and Mensheviki in Bulgaria

The recent revolution in Bulgaria has been the product of Bolshevism. It is the result of the revolutionary action of the proletariat and peasantry, and not the result of the action of the bourgeoisie and a handful of Leninist opportunists. The chief proposal of the Bolsheviks is the distribution of the great landed estates.

The Socialist movement presents interesting features, which were recently analyzed by A. Nyman in the New York "Daily Mail" as follows:

"The Socialist movement in Bulgaria is represented by two parties. The Social Democratic Party. The former party is termed 'broad' and the latter 'narrow.' The former can rightly be termed Menshevik opportunist and the latter proletarian Bolshevik. There is a bitter struggle between the two parties, a struggle of principle, and one must own that the Bolshevik policy is becoming accepted. [This was written before the Bulgarian revolution.]

"The Bulgarian Mensheviki, the opportunist Socialists, are blood of the blood of the international opportunist. They recognize wholly the principle of opportunist in which allows cooperation with bourgeois liberals. They stand for the annihilation of the hope democratic sections of the population, refusing in reality to follow the policy of a proletarian proletarian struggle; in this party the peasants predominate and all shades of liberal intellectuals. We can justly call this party a party of petty bourgeois democracy.

"The Bulgarian Mensheviki, as represented by their leaders, accepted the world war in the spirit of German social-patriotism. In 1916 a few prominent leaders of the 'broad' party visited Germany, where at the meetings they declared themselves faithful to the 'democracy' of the Central Powers 'who were fighting Centralism.' The Bulgarian government on several occasions declared that the support rendered by these 'broad' Socialists had been very valuable. It is not surprising, then, that the treacherous government of Ferdinand paid them in confidence—and easy jobs.

"The Bulgarian Bolsheviks of the 'narrow' party are very influential among the proletarian masses, predominant in almost all industrial centres, uninterested by the opportunists.

"In the question of internal and foreign policy our comrades, the Bulgarian Bolsheviks, have always been guided by a consistent conception of the class struggle. They have always been bitter enemies not only of Bulgarian reaction, but also of Bulgarian liberalism. They have never accepted the Menshevik philosophy of 'the unity of the democratic forces' that in union with the 'radical' and 'liberal' bourgeoisie.

"The Ferdinand government, of course, ignored our comrades by the hundred. According to the figures of 1917, more than one thousand members of the 'narrow' party were in prison, and over six hundred men, under and above military age, had been organized into the army.

"But they have always demanded an end of the war and a democratic peace. Inspired by the Russian Revolution, they increased their propaganda, and they are talking the matter incessantly."

A clear picture is a graph of how the American press gives information to the local population about Europe can be gleaned from the article of a certain New York merchant in the World's Week.

The New York merchant informs us: "Marlow has been appointed a Bolshevik Ambassador to stand."

A certain memo from the North Carolina is an excellent Commission for internal affairs.

Frank's wife acquired nothing and went to Stockholm to disperse.

Mr. Williams, contributor to the respectable Times, again raises an alarm about the fate of Russia, and this alarm is being echoed by the whole bourgeois American press.

The Germans left Russia—says Williams.

Well and good. Now it is the Allies' turn—every logically thinking man will say.

Bolsheviki

It is not only in Russia that the revolution is spreading, but also in Bulgaria. The revolution in Bulgaria is the result of the action of the proletariat and peasantry, and not the result of the action of the bourgeoisie and a handful of Leninist opportunists. The chief proposal of the Bolsheviks is the distribution of the great landed estates.

The Socialist movement presents interesting features, which were recently analyzed by A. Nyman in the New York "Daily Mail" as follows:

"The Socialist movement in Bulgaria is represented by two parties. The Social Democratic Party. The former party is termed 'broad' and the latter 'narrow.' The former can rightly be termed Menshevik opportunist and the latter proletarian Bolshevik. There is a bitter struggle between the two parties, a struggle of principle, and one must own that the Bolshevik policy is becoming accepted. [This was written before the Bulgarian revolution.]

"The Bulgarian Mensheviki, the opportunist Socialists, are blood of the blood of the international opportunist. They recognize wholly the principle of opportunist in which allows cooperation with bourgeois liberals. They stand for the annihilation of the hope democratic sections of the population, refusing in reality to follow the policy of a proletarian proletarian struggle; in this party the peasants predominate and all shades of liberal intellectuals. We can justly call this party a party of petty bourgeois democracy.

"The Bulgarian Mensheviki, as represented by their leaders, accepted the world war in the spirit of German social-patriotism. In 1916 a few prominent leaders of the 'broad' party visited Germany, where at the meetings they declared themselves faithful to the 'democracy' of the Central Powers 'who were fighting Centralism.' The Bulgarian government on several occasions declared that the support rendered by these 'broad' Socialists had been very valuable. It is not surprising, then, that the treacherous government of Ferdinand paid them in confidence—and easy jobs.

"The Bulgarian Bolsheviks of the 'narrow' party are very influential among the proletarian masses, predominant in almost all industrial centres, uninterested by the opportunists.

"In the question of internal and foreign policy our comrades, the Bulgarian Bolsheviks, have always been guided by a consistent conception of the class struggle. They have always been bitter enemies not only of Bulgarian reaction, but also of Bulgarian liberalism. They have never accepted the Menshevik philosophy of 'the unity of the democratic forces' that in union with the 'radical' and 'liberal' bourgeoisie.

"The Ferdinand government, of course, ignored our comrades by the hundred. According to the figures of 1917, more than one thousand members of the 'narrow' party were in prison, and over six hundred men, under and above military age, had been organized into the army.

"But they have always demanded an end of the war and a democratic peace. Inspired by the Russian Revolution, they increased their propaganda, and they are talking the matter incessantly."

A clear picture is a graph of how the American press gives information to the local population about Europe can be gleaned from the article of a certain New York merchant in the World's Week.

The New York merchant informs us: "Marlow has been appointed a Bolshevik Ambassador to stand."

A certain memo from the North Carolina is an excellent Commission for internal affairs.

Frank's wife acquired nothing and went to Stockholm to disperse.

Mr. Williams, contributor to the respectable Times, again raises an alarm about the fate of Russia, and this alarm is being echoed by the whole bourgeois American press.

The Germans left Russia—says Williams.

Well and good. Now it is the Allies' turn—every logically thinking man will say.

It is not only in Russia that the revolution is spreading, but also in Bulgaria. The revolution in Bulgaria is the result of the action of the proletariat and peasantry, and not the result of the action of the bourgeoisie and a handful of Leninist opportunists. The chief proposal of the Bolsheviks is the distribution of the great landed estates.

The Socialist movement presents interesting features, which were recently analyzed by A. Nyman in the New York "Daily Mail" as follows:

"The Socialist movement in Bulgaria is represented by two parties. The Social Democratic Party. The former party is termed 'broad' and the latter 'narrow.' The former can rightly be termed Menshevik opportunist and the latter proletarian Bolshevik. There is a bitter struggle between the two parties, a struggle of principle, and one must own that the Bolshevik policy is becoming accepted. [This was written before the Bulgarian revolution.]

Revolutionary Socialism in Germany

By Karl Liebknecht

WHAT was the meaning of March 24, 1916? The eighteen delegates who finally decided on December 21, 1915, to vote against the first war credit, voted on March 24th openly against the proposed special war budget. While in December they issued a "declaration," they now gave the motives for their vote in a speech. The content of this speech, however, did not go beyond the declaration of December. Even the excuse that Germany was safe against invasion was again brought forward. What was it then that caused a sensation on March 24th? It was the wild uproar of the Socialist majority, together with the bourgeois parties, the infamous attitude of the president, the expulsion of the eighteen from the official party parliamentary group. But in this action, the eighteen were "object" and not "subject"; this action was forced upon them and they disliked a rupture so much, that they tried their best to avoid, still in January 1916, an open break with the treacherous majority, as well as tumultuous scenes against bourgeois parties. And even now on March 24, 1916, they play the part of offended innocence rather than that of showing the clenched fist of rebellion.

What then, is the meaning of March 24th? A true opinion can only be formed in connection with the general situation. The new "Arbeitsgemeinschaft" are the same eighteen, the "neither flesh nor fish" policy of whom proved a failure in December and again in the submarine issue on March 22nd, and again in the discussions March 23rd. Could you expect the lambs of yesterday to become all of a sudden lions?

Just now the so-called "losen blaetter" (loose leaflets) are published by comrades affiliated with the group of the eighteen. These leaflets do not even mention the important fundamental problems which are at stake. Direct taxes instead of indirect ones is about the highest wisdom of the program on taxation of the eighteen in the midst of the world war! They do not show any deeper insight into the problem of taxation. They do not even see, as was stated in the resolution of the Convention in Chemnitz, that direct taxes can as well be saddled upon the masses and that the decision as to what part of the burden will rest on each class, finally is a problem of political power, not a problem of tax reform; that it depends upon the political and economical situation as a whole, the tax policy being an organic part of the general policy. They do not even see, that the best possible direct tax on top of a system of indirect taxes may easily become a fig leaf of the system and a barrier against a thorough reorganization of the system of indirect taxes. Under the heading "How long will it last", the loose leaflets of the eighteen talk about war in sentimental language, without saying a word about the imperialistic causes of the war. The war is considered due to stupidity of the rulers! They give as highest wisdom the theory that Imperialism has led to a deadlock out of which the Governments cannot find an escape, so that they need the advice of the loose leaflets. . . a pitiable mixture indeed!

And what about the stand of the "Arbeitsgemeinschaft" in the first test in the Budget committee? Two days prior to the explosion, this group did not take any decisive stand on the submarine issue. Now the delegate in the Budget committee argued, on humanitarian declarations about the horror of the war, against the sinking of vessels without warning. No understanding was shown that the submarine issue is first of all decided by the ultimate aim of the war, as the result of a struggle of groups of capitalists for the control of the war-policy according to the sharpening

INTRODUCTION

Karl Liebknecht was sent to prison by the government of the Kaiser for four and one half years because of propaganda against the war. Released from prison by the Revolution, Liebknecht is now the dynamic individual expression of the Revolution.

On August 4, 1914, the representatives of the Social Democratic Party in the Reichstag, speaking through their official spokesman Hugo Haase, approved and voted for the first war credit. On the second credit, Karl Liebknecht voted "No!" On December 21, 1915, eighteen Social Democratic representatives, the Haase-Ledebour Group, voted against the fifth war credit, and on March 21, 1916 they voted against a special credit. This created a storm, the eighteen were expelled from the Social Democratic Party.

Many Socialists considered that these eighteen represented revolutionary Socialism, that they voted against the war because of revolutionary convictions. This was not the fact, as Karl Liebknecht makes amply clear in this article to the comrades, written after March 21, almost two years ago.

The eighteen of the Haase-Ledebour group subsequently organized the Independent Socialist Party. This party was neither one thing nor the other; it was against the war, but not on definite Socialist issues; it wanted to go back to the days before August 4, instead of forward to the new tactics and the new International. Liebknecht and other revolutionary Socialists in Germany attacked this party; and today the Independent Socialist Party, by its wavering and essentially counter-revolutionary policy, is confirming the analysis Liebknecht makes in this article of their tendency. The intellectual expression of this party is Karl Kautsky, the moderate and compromiser, the man who manufactured one theoretical justification after another for the Social Democratic Party's abandonment of Socialist principles, the man who declared four years ago that all Socialists were justified in supporting their governments since all nations were on the defensive.

This article of Liebknecht's is an historic document and deserves the serious study of every Socialist.

of the war political situation, and a fight for political power in home policy, in which the scene was carefully prepared to stage Bethman-Hollweg as a liberal and moderate Imperialist, in order to facilitate the treacherous policy of the leaders of the party and labor unions. The delegate of the eighteen even went so far as to advocate again the abolition of the right of confiscation, to attack the English capitalists instead of the German Government at a moment in which this latter Government capitulated before the most unscrupulous war fanatics and needed the most energetic opposition. This policy means a continuance of the Baralong policy of Ledebour on January 15th.

Whether all of the eighteen and all of the "official" opposition in Berlin accept the responsibility for the loose leaflets and the policy of their delegates or not—a group, leaders of which express such opinions, are very far from a policy on principles, although they may claim so loudly. The formal combination of all kinds of indefinite oppositional feelings and motives is always a great danger, especially so in a time of world changes. This means confusion and dragging along on old lines, it sterilizes and kills the militant elements, which get into this mixed company. What must be the conclusion from all this?

The warning against uncritical overestimating of the action of the eighteen and of the events on March 24th. The warning, to keep your eyes open, not to forget that if we should join the eighteen unconditionally, this would mean the surest way to make the new group a shield to cover the governmental policy, and to make the 24th of March a mere phantom, just as December 21st has already become a ghostly historic event. In so far as March 24th means progress, this is to a great extent due to the uncompromising critics of all half-heartedness; it confirms the efficiency of these critics on the strengthening of the oppositional spirit.

The tactic of endless consideration and avoiding

of conflicts and decisions is dictated by the events on March 24th. In the turmoil of a world war all compromising breaks miserably together. Whoever tries to move around between warring armies will be shot from both sides, unless he saves his life in time by joining one party or the other, where, however, he will be received not as a hero, but as a fugitive. The way of the eighteen was a round about way, and not a pleasant one either. Not one advantage worth while to a serious man in this serious period has been gained by this delay.

The masses were ripe for the test already at the beginning of the war. They would not have failed. The only result of the hesitation and doubt has been the strengthening of poisonous opportunism.

Clear cut principles, uncompromising fighting, whole-hearted decision!

Uncompromising Socialist action against the war, against those who caused it, who profit by it, who want to continue to support the war! Also against the supporters of those who slander the name of Social Democrats. Against the policy of the majority, against the National Committee and the Executive Committee of the party, against the Central Committee of the labor unions and all instances of the party and the unions that carry this treacherous policy. To counteract this policy with all means is now the main issue of the war against war. A struggle to gain the majority against the party, misrepresented by the demagogues of the majority. A struggle for democracy in the party, for the rights of the masses of the comrades, against the failing and treacherous leaders, who form the main supporters of the war. Against all of those who in peace time have played into the hands of militarism by opposing mass action in favor of law and order, and who now hang around in the waiting rooms of the army headquarters and the imperial ministers.

Now is the moment to throw away all formal considerations. The party machinery is used ever more and more without scruple by the bureaucrats to enforce their policy. Autocratic decisions are standard feature in the party. After the methods of von Puttkamer, power is used to force the opposition, the meanest methods of Prussian-Russian police brutality are used by the party leaders against the minority. The independence of the party press is disregarded with growing brutality by the so-called party majority. Even the censorship of martial law is beaten by the docile scholars of the military terror of the official Socialist party. War against this party all along the line, to conquer the party for the party! War against the traitors and usurpers, who must be driven from their jobs and mandates laden with the disgust of the workers!

Reconquering of the party from the bottom up through revolt of the masses, who will have to take their organization into their own hands! Not only words, but deeds! Away with all doubt and cowardice! Away with compromise and a policy of the swamp! Away with half friends, feeble mindedness and sentimentalists! Those are out of place where the fight is heart against heart. The struggle for a decision in the party is on! It must be fought without any consideration for the sacrilegists, the traitors, the deserters from Socialism.

To the present system of party politics, not a man and not a cent, but a fight to a finish. Those who are not with us in this fight will be considered against us!

Chapters from My Diary

By Leon Trotsky

In Switzerland—The "German Treason"—Plekhanov—Greulich.

I ARRIVED in Zurich on August 4, 1914. Switzerland was then already over-run with fugitives from the warring countries. The central question in Swiss life had become—the potato. Would there or would there not be enough? The violation of Belgian neutrality, the first commandments of the general staffs, lists of killed and wounded, these things were already finding difficulty in obtaining a hearing, but the question of the food supply was beginning to be imperative. And the Russians who were stranded in Switzerland also conceived of world affairs, in these early days, from the angle of the kitchen-garden. Credit suddenly had gone to pieces; communications with Russia were broken, the banks stopped changing Russian money, then they would pay 100 francs for 100 roubles, then the rate would go up, then down, and then they stopped altogether.

"They were giving 240 francs for 100 roubles this morning."

"You don't say!"

"Yes, they were. You see England declared war yesterday. Change your fifty roubles at once, or tomorrow Italy will come in, and they'll begin giving us nothing again."

The Russian traveling public, the emigrants, the students, the pleasure-seekers, formed a Committee of Public Welfare out of their midst, around which all the fugitives grouped themselves, the army deserter, the member of the Odessa supreme court, the Jewish laborer, the director of a hospital, some actresses, etc., etc. At Geneva they formed a General Administration for Economic Welfare, in the Russian colony, under the presidency of the Caucasian social-democrat T, who, as is the custom, was called "Comrade Chairman." Wessel, the Russian Consul, who was present at the meetings (oh, sweet were the days of national unity!) asked his neighbor in great astonishment: "If this is only the Comrade of the Chairman, who is the real Chairman?"—after which he respectfully addressed his remarks to T.

After the food crisis had abated, there began a discussion, among the political emigrants, as to the conduct of the Socialist parties of the various countries. The agreement of the German Social-Democratic Party to vote the first five milliards of war credits, created an impression of dismay. Many would not believe it, and insisted that the August 5th number of the Berlin "Vorwaerts," which brought us Haase's declaration, was a simple creation of the German General Staff, intended to confuse the enemy as to the internal conditions of Germany.

The first rather indistinct tendencies were already observable toward the formation of groups within the party. P. B. Axelrod was completely upset by the "treason of the Germans"; for that is what we called the consent of August 4th in our private conversations. "If Bebel were still alive," declared Axelrod, "he would never have permitted it." The action of the French Socialists, who on that very day, August 5th, did exactly what the Germans had done, namely, voted the war credits, made much less of an impression. Most of us had always considered the French Socialism inferior to the German, and others, Axelrod among them, found "extenuating circumstances" pleading for the French in the circumstances of the war itself.

We began to receive news of the position of Plekhanov, who, at the beginning of the war, was in Paris. This news was not very definite at first, but what there was of it was calculated to produce the greatest disquietude. I had a number of conversations with Axelrod on this subject and he would never admit the possibility that Plekhanov would turn out to be a patriot. "I admit that he will make distinctions in his estimates of French and German Socialism, and that he will desire a French victory, but that he will come out for a victory of the Czar's armies—never!"

I did not share this confidence. Already at the time of the Russo-Japanese War, Plekhanov occupied a position by himself in the "Iskra" Group of those days. To be sure, he did not voice his patriotic feelings aloud, and at the Amsterdam Congress he ostentatiously shook the hand of Kata-

jama, yet at the same time, he was openly hostile to the confidence, then so dear to the revolutionist, that the forces of Czarism would meet at Bucharest, Rakovsky told me that just at the time of the Russo-Japanese War, Plekhanov had assured him with greater frankness than he had shown toward us, that in his opinion the idea that Socialism should be "anti-nationalist," and that it should "work for national defeat" (to use the expression that has since become current), was an importation into the party that had been brought about by the Hebrew intellectuals. This assertion must have appeared all the more remarkable to Rnkovsky in view of the fact that at that time not only the radical intellectuals, but even the majority of the Liberal intellectuals, with Milyukov at their head, were permeated with outspoken "defeatist" sentiments. Later, in July, 1914, two or three weeks before the opening of the war, on the occasion of the "unifying" Russian Conference at Brussels, I understood from a number of guarded observations made by Plekhanov, that he was not well-disposed toward the "anti-patriotic" campaign which I had carried on in my communications from Serbia and Bulgaria at the time of the Balkan War. All these things produced in me in August, 1914, an attitude of suspicion toward the anointed leader of the Russian Social-Democracy. But the actual course of events far outstripped my most gloomy expectations. In Paris, Plekhanov blessed the Russian Revolutionary Volunteers in their struggle with

"Prussian militarism," and then was unable to muster manhood enough within himself to raise a voice in protest, when French militarism, represented in the persons of the non-coms of the Foreign Legion, subjected the unhappy Russian idealists to degrading indignities. Plekhanov sent a communication to the Bulgarians, summoning them to intervene in the war on the side of the Allies. Plekhanov mobilized Kant in the defense of Czarist diplomacy. Plekhanov agitated for Italian intervention in the war by writing the most extravagant chauvinistic articles for the Italian yellow journals. And, finally, Plekhanov combined with certain backward laborites and populists, and with the renegade Alexinsky, to form the staff of the Paris "Prizyv" ("The Call"), which, from number to number, stamped us, the internationalists, as the agents of the German General Staff.

But let us return to the opening of the war. In Zurich I met Greulich, a German, the patriarch of the Swiss Social Democracy. Not of tall stature, but rugged; not stout, but heavy; a complete contrast to his contemporary, the late Bebel, whose leanness was more like that of an emaciated steel spring; Greulich produces an immediate impression of importance, with his white mane and the deep furrows of his thoughtful face. He was fiercely indignant in these first weeks with the action of the German Socialists; later the power of his indignation went down day by day.

"The International no longer exists," said Greulich, and I at once entered this observation of his in my notebook. "In the discharge of our every-day political labors," he continued, "we feel that we are a real force, and we really are a force. But when great masses sweep over the stage of action, when it is clear that we constitute a minority, we may easily be hurled out of our political pride into political self-debasement. To me, that is the key to an understanding of all that is going on. Victor Adler, Austerlitz, Renner, are splendid Socialists, but even they will be lost altogether with the rest of the party in the welter of the politically amorphous masses."

"We are entering upon a period of great crisis for the International. It may be reborn later, but it will not be on the same foundations. We must acknowledge before everything else that the political parties have compromised themselves. The trade unions have kept aloof, but they cannot exist without international bonds between them. It is, therefore, my opinion, that the International will be reborn after the war on the basis of the trade unions."

But Greulich was only partly right in these words. Numerically, to be sure, we Socialists are in the minority. But the class that is waging the war is also in the minority. In our social system there are still great masses of the population that are completely "unhistorical" in their point of view, that is, who in normal times have no kind of political life. The conditions of Capitalism do not permit and never will permit of the elevation of these lowly petit bourgeois, semi-proletarian, semi-hobo classes to the level of an equal participation in the destinies of society. These classes are torn out of their intellectual death only by such catastrophes as war or revolution.

War shatters the fetters of the commonplace, and consequently the oppressive, debasing, unenlightened conditions. War destroys the existing equilibrium, tears one out of the accustomed track, and gives promise of change. War clutches all classes, and, consequently, those who are oppressed and overburdened feel themselves on an equal footing with the wealthy and powerful. These powerful hopes for decisive changes are one of the reasons why war so often brings revolution in its train. Because war alone can never make good the hopes which it arouses. Having convulsed the masses with the most excruciating physical crises, war invariably deceives them in the end. At the very same time sections of society, which in ordinary times are scarcely touched by our propaganda, look in the direction of the revolutionary party for the realization of the hopes which not so long ago they hoped the government would make good, with its apparatus of war. The success of the Revolution depends to no slight degree on the extent to which the Socialist party is able to convince these masses that their hopes are not illusions.

A Campaign of Slander

THE Allied, including also the American capitalist press, has never shown any great inclination to tell the truth in their dispatches of the present progress of events in Russia. If at the beginning of the Revolution this press attempted to be impartial, not in the interpretation of the event, but in the description of its movement, then, very soon, having learned the real character of the event, it changed its front. Instead of facts it is giving the reader fruits of leisure fancy from its special correspondents; instead of at least a show of truth in the reports it gives fictions full of slander, insinuations fabricated by its mercenaries. Until recently this was done with the purpose of distorting the actual meaning of the Russian Revolution and discrediting it in the eyes of the masses of the Allied countries. Now it is being done in order to justify the attack of the Allied governments on the Soviet Republic.

The American capitalist press shows especial zeal, in the slanderous campaign the Allied press is waging against Revolutionary Russia. It lies, lies meanly and shamelessly. Almost every telegram from Russia is a vile invention, every report on Russian events an abominable libel on the Revolution and Russian people.

In connection with the developing Allied intervention in Russia the American newspapers fill their pages with all sorts of absurd fairy tales, such as, the population of the regions where the troops advance hail with joy and enthusiasm their "liberators." But who will believe it? Who will believe that a people who has made the greatest revolution in the history of mankind will "with joy" hail oppressors who are trying to take away from them the conquests they have achieved? Who will believe that a Revolution will hail its own executioners? Who will ever think that there is truth in the assumption that the Russian worker and the peasant, freed from their oppressors, will begin to express joy because the power of the oppressors was going to be restored?

The American press picturing the Russian people as naive primitive men who with joy will exchange the gold of their conquests for the glassy beads of "foreign liberation," this press is lying and slandering. And it knows that it lies. It does it consciously for, it has no other means to justify intervention.

Let then this mistress of the imperialistic bourgeoisie keep silent! Let her not abuse the honor of the Russian people!

The Constituent Assembly in Russia

By John Reed

AT five minutes past four o'clock on the morning of January 19th, 1918, while President Tchernov of the first Russian Constituent Assembly was reading aloud the project of fundamental principles of the agrarian law, a sailor stepped up to the tribune and touched him on the shoulder. Pointing to the empty seats of the Bolsheviks and the Left Social-Revolutionists, he said calmly:

"You fellows had better go home. The rest have gone. It's very late and the guard is tired."

Half an hour later, having passed a resolution calling for immediate peace, a law confiscating landed property, and declaring Russia to be a democratic federative republic, the Constituent Assembly adjourned, nevermore to meet—in this or any other world.

So ended the historic session of what was probably the most democratically-elected governing body the world has ever seen. Out of about five hundred delegates present only 170 were Bolsheviks, and some 40 Left Social-Revolutionists—while the rest, about 250 Social-Revolutionists of the right and center, 10 Cadets, half a dozen Mensheviks and United Social Democrats (Gorki's party), and the rest Mussulmen, Jews, Ukrainians, Estonians, Letts, etc., can be roughly characterized as "anti-Bolshevik." Did this not show that Russia, after two months of Bolshevism, rejected the party and policies of the Council of People's Commissars? No, its significance was much greater; it demonstrated conclusively and forever the impotence of the old-time political state as an expression of the will of the majority.

The next day the Central Executive Committee of the All-Russian Soviets met at Smolny and passed the following resolution, which I quote at some length because it explains the feeling behind the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly:

"The Russian revolution, since its inception, has put forward the Soviets of Workmen, Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies as the means of organization of all the laboring and exploited classes which alone can direct the struggle of these classes for their complete economic and political liberation.

"During all the first period of the Russian revolution, the Soviets multiplied, grew and expanded, realizing by their own experience the emptiness of all illusions about a conciliation with the bourgeoisie, and the vanity of all forms of bourgeois-parliamentary democracy; and they have finally come to the conclusion that it is impossible to emancipate the oppressed classes without breaking completely with these forms, and with all conciliations of any kind. This rupture was realized by the November revolution, and the transfer of all power into the hands of the Soviets.

"The Constituent Assembly, elected upon the basis of electoral lists which were drawn up before the November revolution, is the expression of the old-time political relations between Cadets and the conciliators then in power.

"For example, the people could not, while voting for the candidates of the Socialist Revolutionary party, distinguish between the S. R. right and center, ally of the bourgeoisie, and the left S. R., partisans of Socialism. In this fashion the Constituent, which was to have been the crown of the bourgeois-parliamentary republic, could not but become an obstacle in the way of the November revolution and the Soviet power. Because it gave the power to the Soviets, and, through them, to the laboring and exploited classes, the November revolution provoked a desperate resistance on the part of the exploiters, and in the crushing of this resistance, the November revolution manifested itself plainly as the beginning of the social revolution.

"The working-class was forced to convince itself by experience that bourgeois parliamentarism had outlived its usefulness, that it was absolutely incompatible with the realization of Socialism,—that not national institutions, but only class institutions are powerful enough to break the resistance of the propertied classes and lay the foundation of Socialist society.

"All restriction of the power of the Soviets, power conquered by the people of the Republic of Soviets, in favor of bourgeois parliamentarism and the Constituent, would be now a step backward and signify the failure of the entire workers' and peasants' revolution of November.

"Opened the 18th of January, the Constituent, because of well-known circumstances, gave the

majority of the party of the right Social-Revolutionists, the party of Kerensky, of Avksentiev and of Tchernov. Naturally this party refused to examine the proposition made by the supreme organ of the Soviet power, a proposition clear, precise and admitting no equivocation, to adopt the 'Declaration of the Rights of the Working and Exploited People,' to recognize the November revolution and the Soviet power. By that refusal the Constituent broke all bonds with the Russian Soviet Republic. Therefore, inevitably, the Bolsheviks and the Left Social-Revolutionists must withdraw from such a Constituent, forming as they do at present an immense majority in the Soviets and possessing the confidence of the workers and most of the peasants.

"Outside of the Constituent the parties of the majority of this Assembly, the right S. R. and the Mensheviks, carry on an open war against the power of the Soviets, inclining in their organs the people to overturn this power, and by that fact aiding the resistance of the exploiters to the transfer of the land and the factories into the hands of the workers.

"It is clear that the part of the Constituent which remains can only play the part of screen to the attempt of the bourgeois counter-revolution to destroy the power of the Soviets.

"In consequence, it is resolved by the Central Executive Committee:

"That the Constituent Assembly be dissolved."

What happened? Did Russia attempt to rise in revolt? Was there an outcry? The only audible protest came from the London Times, the Paris Temps, the New York Herald, and Gustave Ilver. There was no revolt in Russia; on the contrary, a sort of immense sigh of relief swept the country, and the Cossacks finally began to turn against Kaledine. As for the members of the dissolved Constituent, for a few days they muttered angry plans to meet illegally in Finland or the Don and raise the banner of rebellion; but to their intense astonishment they found that the masses of the people accepted the dissolution with perfect calm,—even forgot it entirely, and turned their attention to the Third Convention of All-Russian Soviets, which assembled in the seats of the Constituent Assembly five days later, and declared Russia forever the property of the toiling masses, a republic of Soviets, the invincible sword of the social revolution. . . . whole two bands played the "Internationale" and the "Marseillaise" simultaneously, and seven hundred big bearded workers and peasants kissed each other with tears rolling down their cheeks.

So ended the last act of the battle between the Russian bourgeoisie and proletariat, between the Soviets and the Constituent, between parliamentary democracy and—something new.

It will be objected that the Soviets are only a new form of parliamentary democracy, much like the primitive Anglo-Saxon "town meeting." But, as a matter of fact, the Soviet is a new invention. In the first place it consists of delegates elected by small units of the working population, with the property-holding classes excluded. Meeting frequently, its members can be recalled and replaced by their constituents at any time, and so the entire complexion of the local Soviets, and through them, the central Soviets, must change automatically with the change of mass opinion, which is particularly sensitive in time of revolution. Then consider the All-Russian Convention of Soviets, which meets at least every three months, and oftener if any special question demands it; with such a machinery of government a new Constituent Assembly of all Russia is held four times a year. And the authority of the small Soviets is not delegated to the larger Soviets, but like them, based on the direct vote of the peasants in their fields, the workmen in their factories and the soldiers in barracks and trenches.

Now in the course of the Russian revolution, which in the short space of eight months lived through almost every known form of government, the Soviets, which were founded in order to defend the interests of the proletariat in the building of new Russia, learned by experience what it has taken the working class of the world a hundred years to begin to see—that the modern constitutional democratic state is based on a civil war of the classes. In the beginning the Soviets acquiesced in the bourgeois government, themselves playing the part of a sort of democratic

threat over the heads of the Ministers.

The Russian masses had three imperative wants—peace, land, and some sort of workers' co-operation in the management of industry. As yet, however, these three demands were expressed by the Soviets in the form of: general peace in conjunction with the Allies; settlement of the land question at the Constituent Assembly; and a sort of government supervision of industry. The great majority of the Soviets was Menshevik and right Social-Revolutionary—that is to say, "moderate Socialist." During the first three months of the Revolution the philosophy of the Russian democracy may be roughly summarized in the following formula:

"The social revolution is impossible. First, the Russian proletariat is not prepared; second, a Socialist Russia cannot exist in the midst of a capitalistic Europe."

Before the coalition of the Soviet leaders with the bourgeois leaders, the Soviets had emphasized the clearly-expressed will of the Russian masses, peace, land, industrial democracy. But now consider what happened. The "Socialist" ministers found themselves absolutely unable to carry on their class war against the bourgeois ministers in the Government. Whenever democratic proposals were brought forward, the bourgeois ministers threatened to resign, passively resisted, delayed, postponed. Tchernov, Socialist Minister of Agriculture, was unable to get adopted the mildest measure of a whole series of land reforms—the law relating to the valuation of real property; he was finally forced to sit quietly by and allow the arrest of the peasant Land Committees, which had been formed at the request of the first Provisional Government itself. Skobelev, Minister of Labor, was unable to persuade the rest of the Cabinet to sanction his program for the participation of the labor unions in the administration of factories, and was finally bullied into attempting to restrict the growing influence of the Factory Shop Committees. Tsereteli himself when the Cronstadt workmen and sailors deposed a tyrannical government commissar and elected one of their own was persuaded to go to Cronstadt, and in the name of the Soviets restore the previous commissar. Kerensky, threatened not only by the hostility of the Russian bourgeois government, but also by the bourgeois governments of the Allies, and especially the United States, forced upon the war-weary Russian army the great offensive of July, which crumbled into ghastly disaster at Tarnopol.

Meanwhile the Russian bourgeoisie inaugurated a plan of deliberate sabotage in factories, mines, farms, railroads. In an interview with one of the great financiers of Russia, Stepan Lianosov, I was told with amazing frankness how the propertied classes were "starving the Revolution"; coal mines were flooded, factory machinery wrecked and the shops closed down, railroads were disorganized. In the army the officer class was also working to destroy the soldiers' committees and Soviets, and restore the old-fashioned autocratic discipline so fatal to revolutionary thought. Through the complacency of Kerensky the death penalty was re-introduced and applied to political agitators of the left wing; Socialist newspapers were shut down; and military defeat was brought about. Besides many other proofs in my possession, I publish herewith one of the secret documents discovered in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which sheds a bright light on the fall of Riga:

"Baron Paschiatti to Baron Sonnino at Rome Jassy, August 22—September 4, 1917.

"Diamandi has telegraphed to Bratianu (Rumanian premier) from the Stavka, where he is for the moment, using the direct wire between Stavka and the Russian command in Rumania, for the purpose of transmitting his conversation with General Kornilov. The General told him that he should not attach great importance to the fall of Riga. The General added that the troops abandoned Riga on his orders. . . . General Kornilov counts also on the impression which the fall of Riga will produce upon public opinion, to the end of the immediate re-establishment of discipline in the Russian army."

It was in April that Lenin came to Petrograd, with his clear vision of the consequences of Socialist coalition with the bourgeoisie, as exemplified in all the warring countries—by the Vanderveldes, the Albert Thomas, the William English

Wallings. I believe that almost alone in Russia, perhaps in the whole world, Lenin appreciated the significance and possibilities of the Soviets. It was he who saw what was coming; it was he who first raised the great cry, "All Power to the Soviets." As the Soviet leaders themselves were more and more carried away on the side of apathy, or even opposition to, the will of the masses; as the masses felt themselves more and more abandoned, leaderless—the Bolshevik propaganda made rapid progress among them, culminating in the spontaneous but abortive uprising of July 16-18, which momentarily checked the spread of Bolshevism, but accomplished two other intensely important things: first, it almost wrecked the prestige of the Soviets, and secondly, it forced the moderate Socialists over to the side of the bourgeoisie.

With the Soviets weakened, the Bolsheviks ruined, the bourgeoisie grew suddenly insolent and impatient. The agrarian riots, caused by the Government's refusal to keep its promises about the land question, were suppressed by Cossacks; everywhere the left wing Socialists were imprisoned, or rendered absolutely powerless—even in the Soviets. Almost openly, and with the participation of the Socialists in the Ministry, Kornilov was invited to become a second Napoleon. But the bourgeoisie had not estimated the latent strength of the revolutionary masses, who rose as one man as soon as the issue became clear. And the Kornilov attempt immediately revived the Soviets, those extraordinarily efficient instruments of revolutionary action, and raised the Bolsheviks at one bound into power. It was in September that the Soviets began to change their complexion—over night—first the Petrograd Soviet, then that of Moscow, Kiev, Odessa, followed by the smaller Soviets. At last the masses knew the way they should go, although their course of action was not yet clear.

But the bourgeoisie knew its danger, and determined at one stroke to crush the power of the Soviets forever. The real question in the mind of both sides had become the question of coalition with the bourgeoisie. And in the Democratic Conference, and afterward in the Provisional Conference, and afterward in the Provisional Conference, the best service of all the influence they possessed, Kerensky and the Socialist Ministers won the day for coalition, against the openly crystalline opposition of all the masses of Russia. And what of the Soviets? In the Isvestia of September 15th the Central Executive Committee spoke of the Coalition Government as follows:

"At last a truly democratic government, born of the will of all classes of the Russian people, the first rough form of the future liberal parliamentary regime, has been formed. Ahead of us is the Constituent Assembly, which will solve all questions of fundamental law, and whose composition will be essentially democratic. The function of the Soviets is at an end, and the time is approaching when they must retire, with the rest of the revolutionary machinery, from the stage of a free and victorious people, whose weapons shall hereafter be the peaceful ones of political action."

At the opening meeting of the new Council of the Russian Republic, Trotsky rose to his feet on

behalf of the Bolsheviks, and cried, "With this government of the People's Treason we Bolsheviks have nothing to do!" And the Bolsheviks walked out. For them the issue was clear. The Petrograd in the first week in November, and the bourgeoisie, intelligentsia and moderate Socialists, or the proletariat.

Nobody doubted that this was—the final battle for governmental power, which is by far the most important question of revolution. The allies of the bourgeoisie, tried every possible means to stop the meeting of the All-Russian Soviets—telegraphing their lieutenants all over Russia to hinder the election, declare against the congress, etc. It was at just that time that I had an interview with the secretary of the Central Committee of the Cadet Party. He said:

"Since the Kornilov affair we Cadets don't dare be very active in public. Moreover, it is not necessary. The Moderate Socialists are doing all the dirty work for us, although too stupid to know with it, but it co-operates with nobody."

But, as a matter of fact, the bourgeoisie made the same mistake it had made in the days of Kornilov. Flushed with triumph, it created a sort of parliament (Council of the Republic) which had no power, and an irresponsible Ministry. In this parliament the Cadet members even declared that it was illegal to declare Russia a republic! The destruction of the Soviets, restoration of discipline in the army, protection of private property these were the questions discussed. And to crown all, Terestchenko, Minister of Foreign Affairs, stood in the tribune and enumerated the same policy of war to annihilation which the Russian democracy had so strikingly repudiated when the Milnyuk ministry fell in May.

From all over Russia the Soviet delegates were gathering. From his hiding place Lenin lifted his head after day for years of being crying, "Insurrection! Insurrection!" What followed was the November revolution.

All this seems very far away from the question of the Constituent Assembly. And as a matter of fact the revolution of ideas of government in the minds of both sides, fostered by the intense and swift life of the revolution, is clearly reflected in their new point concerning the Constituent Assembly.

In all the first six months of the Revolution the bourgeoisie formed a democratically-elected Constituent Assembly, and postponed the date of its opening again and again, while the democracy clung to it as the solution of all difficulties. Finally the clamor grew so great that the bourgeoisie was forced to agree to the opening of the Constituent at the end of November. But as late as September, one of the Cadet leaders said to me:

"If the Constituent shows any Utopian tendencies, we will execute a military coup d'état, surround the hall with soldiers and arrest the delegates. . . ."

On the other hand, all the masses and their organizations were in favor of the Constituent, and as late as the end of October, when Trotsky and the Bolsheviks left the Council of the Republic,

they declared that they withdrew for one reason because the bourgeoisie wanted to wreck the Constituent, and that they, the Bolsheviks, would defend it with their blood.

This apparent inconsistency with their later action in dissolving the assembly is always emphasized by the capitalist press of all countries, which pretends to believe that the Bolsheviks are as tyrannical as all bodies of men who achieve power, and that they dissolved the Constituent simply because it opposed their wishes. But that is not true.

I have said that in leaving the Council of the Republic the masses knew the way they should go, although their course of action was not clear. For example, there was a strong minority opposed to the insurrectionary policy of Lenin, who were only beaten by a few votes when it came to the question of whether or not to make the November revolution. So it was concerning the question of the Constituent. Although after the establishment of the Pre-parliament the masses knew instinctively that for them parliamentary democracy was a mortal enemy, still they had been educated for fifty years to believe that a Russian National Assembly would solve all their problems, just as the French people thought in 1789-92. Lenin, of course, was against the Constituent Assembly from the beginning, but it was not until after the November revolution, when the Soviets finally began to feel the power of the great Russian mass pouring through all the channels of life, that the majority saw the utter futility of a conventional territorial assembly, elected in the very midst of the November revolution, from electoral lists made up so long before that the Social-Revolutionist party was still set down as one party with a single program, although in October it had split into two separate and distinct parties, with two programs.

Before the November revolution the masses had supported the Constituent, and the bourgeoisie had opposed it because it was plain that the majority would be Socialist, after the November revolution, however, the bourgeoisie supported the Constituent, and the masses opposed it because it was plain that the majority would be moderate Socialists, that is to say, anti-Bolshevik.

But the Soviets were better representative bodies than the Constituent, and the leaders of the Soviets knew that the moderate Socialist majority of the Constituent had no real following. That it hung in the air, like Molyneux's realm. And, indeed, blown upon by the rough breath of the impatient people, the Constituent Assembly vanished like smoke, leaving no trace behind it.

As for the Soviets, when peace has come and the last effort of bourgeois counter-revolution is crushed; when the resistance of the bourgeoisie is finally crushed by the expropriation of all that feeds it; then the political function of the Soviets is largely at an end, and their economic function begins—uniting in themselves the organizations of the workers, the peasants, and leaving to the free urge of life the creative impulses of mankind. Out of these Soviets is coming a new and dreamed-of organization of society; a world in which government consists only in sunning men with the material for the building of happy cities.

The Angel of Death

THE angel of death whispers no more in the trenches of the Western front. "The war to end war" is over—the war that was to end for ever the shriek of the deadly shrapnel, the zip-p-p of the flesh-tearing bullet, the earth-rending crash of the exploding shell, the wash of the hungry torpedo, the lurch of the stricken ship, the drone of the terror of the skies, the red glare of the bombed village, the thunder of deafant artillery, the shrill whistle of command, the thud of flying feet, the hoarse shout of charging battalions, the cold glint of onrushing bayonets, the dull impact of clashing troops, the hiss of the liquid death, the screams of the mangled dying, the curses and moans of the wounded, the heart sobs of deserted women, the wail of the lonely child. . . .

The lowering clouds of the wintry sky no longer conceal a flock of bombing planes, machine-guns no longer bark in the bushes, yonder hill no longer marks a field battery, the smoken ditches, "where men dig their graves and call them trenches," where men trace walks abroad where death so lately tripped

But what of the rest of the world? If the angel of

death no longer stalks the fields of Flanders what of the places where men build their prisons and call them factories, dig sepulchres and call them mines? Does the echo of death's whisper not murmur here?

"The war to end war" is over. But away in the ice-locked north of Russia is not the battle line still far flung? Does not the angel of death whisper over the frozen steppes?

The war is over, but the struggle is on. The class struggle—the struggle of the machine and its owners against man, the struggle which must make man the master of the machine or for ever its slave, the grim battle between man and the machine, between life and a living death—is begun and in Russia it flares into open war.

Into the abode of the machine pour the millions of the world each day. And the machine awakes and roars—a hungry roar, and big millions approach to fresh millions who must be ever on the alert lest they be annihilated, for annihilation means death.

A moment of distraction. . . . A shout. . . . A mo-

mentary jar in the wair of the machine. . . . The angel of death whispers. . . . The machine moves on. . . .

In Russia man conquered the machine and harnessed it to do his bidding so the owners of the machine rush to its aid and the smoldering struggle leazes into the open flame of war. War to destroy those who have fought not only the war to end war but the war to end the tyranny of the machine. War to destroy those who not only would make "the graves called trenches" useless, but who would also sweep away the prisons called factories, the sepulchres called mines, and in their places raise smiling fields, factories no longer prisons, mines no longer sepulchres. War to destroy those who would take the tyranny called profit out of the machine and make it the servant of man to the end that the angel of death should whisper no more because of the machine and its owner.

Peace reigns in Flanders, the angel of death who has ever roared in the trenches of the Western front, but the grim struggle between man and the machine is on, and in Russia the battle line is far flung.

The International Movement

Russia—and the New Revolution
THE advent of the revolutionary proletariat in Germany and Austria has immeasurably strengthened the power of the Soviets in Russia. The Bolsheviks have greatly contributed to the coming of the new revolution not only by their ideas, not only by the force of their wonderful accomplishments in Russia, but by the wide use of Russian Bolshevik agitators in Germany and Austria. While the Brest-Litovsk peace negotiations were going on, the Bolsheviks waged a tremendous revolutionary propaganda among the German troops; after peace was concluded, this propaganda continued and spread into Germany itself, the centre being Bolshevik Ambassador Joffe in Berlin, who co-operated with Rosa Luxemburg, Franz Mehring and other revolutionary Socialists. Upon the outbreak of the revolutionary crisis in Austria, N. I. Bucharin, editor of the Moscow "Social Democrat" and an influential Bolshevik, departed for Vienna. Upon his departure Bucharin declared: "We have to share our knowledge with the West European proletariat, whose movement has no leader or system or determined policy. In this we must help them." Bolshevik agents in Poland are developing a formidable revolutionary movement, the centre of which is Carl Redek.

The Soviet Government has organized a capable Socialist army, which an official of the old regime, recently arrived in Paris, was compelled to admit is a disciplined and effective instrument. The fourth All-Russian Soviet Congress, held in July, decided upon the organization of a large army. Some time later the Central Executive Committee adopted the following resolution: "The joint session of the Moscow Executive Committee and the Moscow Soviet approves the policy of the Soviet Government which constantly puts into practice the decisions of the fourth extraordinary All-Russian Congress. The joint session assumes that the main problem of the Soviets, under the prevailing conditions, is increased activity in the organization of a strong Soviet army, strengthening of all organizations which embrace the masses of workers and peasants, the strengthening of internal harmony and discipline in the ranks of these organizations. In the transitory period we are passing through, the Soviet Government must strengthen the dictatorship over the bourgeoisie. By harmonious and energetic work of all the comrades devoted to the task of completing the November Revolution, we will reach, in spite of all obstacles, the complete success of the world's Social Revolution."

In Germany—Bolsheviks and Others
ROSA LUXEMBURG and Karl Liebknecht are working harmoniously in the great revolutionary struggle, emerging as dominating factors in the situation.

The international revolutionary Socialists in Bremen recently issued a pamphlet declaring that not only the Scheidemann majority Socialists, but also the Independent Socialists of the Haase type, are simply adepts in radical phrases while avoiding deeds; the Internationalists and Communists insist upon revolutionary action.

Prior to the revolutionary explosion, the masses were stirring into action, opposed by the union and "Socialist" bureaucrats. The Miners' Union issued an appeal to the workers in the Rhine coal basin calling upon them to be calm and not tolerate strike propaganda. The appeal declared that partial strikes had broken out in the industrial districts of Essen, threatening to spread to other regions.

The soldiers also were uneasy. On August 5, German soldiers at Reval disarmed themselves to show that they were tired of war. The telephone wires were cut, and at meetings held the same day speakers denounced war. The cry was: "Enough of bloodshed! We do not want to fight any longer!" Two hundred soldiers were arrested. At Felline, in Livonia, at the end of July, trouble started in the garrison, which thereupon received orders to place itself in readiness for the western front—an order never executed. Detachments sent to enforce the order joined the rebels, organized a joint meeting, ending with singing revolutionary songs. After the meeting, the soldiers marched to the railway station, divested themselves of all military insignia, and boarded the trains. Upon their arrival at the Meiskull depot, they met detachments coming from Perman and Weissenstein on their way to the western front. After a meeting, the new soldiers divested themselves of military insignia and dispersed with

cries: "Enough of war! Bread and peace!"

Incidents of this sort, together with the mass action of the industrial workers, brought the revolution, in spite of the conservative union bureaucracy and Socialists. Now that the revolution is on, the conservative Socialists want "unity." The Berlin "Vorwaerts" means that the Revolution requires Socialist unity, but that the radicals are breaking the unity. The "Vorwaerts" unity means counter-revolution; there will be unity—after revolutionary Socialism conquers.

The Ideal Soldier

In No. 80 of "Suom-Finland," a paper of German imperialist propaganda published at Helsingfors Finland, there is an article on "The Ideal Soldier," which characterises the ideal of German militarism and of that German-maintained government of Finland which public opinion among the Allies has greeted:

"An impassable gulf separates the soldier, particularly the recruit, from his officers. The last are always right; a recruit—never!

"The soldier must obey the orders of his superior. He must execute them blindly, without thinking.

"The soldier must not even desire to act independently since he is subjected to the will of his superior. The soldier must think, nor speak, because he is obliged to act upon orders of his superior.

"A young soldier is not a man; it is only through the orders of his superior that he becomes a human being.

"Like a worm he must remain in the dust and listen to the whistling of the whip over his head. It is only after weeks and months that the grace of his superior raises a recruit from the dust, washes him, dresses him and transforms him into a man and a soldier.

"The superior of the soldier is a magic mirror, his image must not reveal any vices.

"The superior is a god to the soldier; a god to whom he is not obliged to pray, but whom he must respect and whose divine orders he must execute.

"The god of the soldier is never content and never thankful for accomplished deeds. But he severely punishes insubordination.

"Because the hands of the soldier's superior hold the key to the earthly hell."

This is not satire, but serious propaganda. It

APPRECIATIONS—AND BUSINESS

Bookshop, Chicago: "Received your ten copies, and sold them in as many seconds. Send fifty more immediately."

Ellis O. Jones, New York: "I just got hold of Vol. 1, No. 2, of The Revolutionary Age. I like its tone, its spirit and its contents. There should be tremendous demand for just this sort of thing. We must steer a straight course at this critical time. I am going to mention your paper in a speech which I am making tomorrow night before the I. S. S. I am going to hold it up as a concrete example of the kind of thing we need and the kind of thing we will get in American journalism. If there is anything I can do for you, let me know."

F. G. Vasmuth, Boston: "The night of your address at the English Club the following members subscribed for The Revolutionary Age. The slips were not all turned in, I am sure, but those I have rescued are as follows:—"

ORDER A BUNDLE!

The Revolutionary Age must reach the masses; it is a vital and a necessary thing.

Get subscribers; the subscription rate is \$1.00 for three months (27 issues). Prepaid subscription cards can be secured in quantity upon receipt of the price.

Particularly good work can be done by means of bundles. Get your local or your union to order a bundle; order a bundle yourself for sale or distribution among your fellow-workers in the shops. Bundle orders are coming in splendidly from New York, Chicago, Cleveland and other cities. Everywhere the paper has reached—enthusiasm and orders! We want to dispose of one hundred thousand copies an issue—it can be done in the next month!

Prices in bundles of ten or more: 2c. a copy, all charges prepaid. Send that order now!

Address

Manager Steinert

885 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.

is simple—beautiful. No wonder the soldiers revolted.

The British Preparing

THE British Labor Party has broken its ties with the government and the ruling class. The vote of 1,844,000 to 891,000. The ultra-reactionary forces declared that severing relations with the government would prove a calamity to the party. The congress adopted a resolution calling for the release of John MacLenn and all other political prisoners, including Conscientious Objectors. MacLenn is a thoroughly revolutionary Socialist, and in 1915 was sentenced to five years imprisonment for revolutionary activity against the war; he has been praised by Lenin, and in the spring of 1918 was appointed Consul of the Soviet Government in Glasgow. MacLenn is the candidate of the Labor Party for Parliament in the Glasgow district. His constituents categorically refused to accept the candidature of "Minister" Barnes, one of the labor decayers in a coalition government of Lloyd George.

The Labor Party enters the coming election with a characteristic opportunistic and social reform program, incapable of rallying the revolutionary masses.

The Independent Labor Party's National Council (the I. L. P. policy approximates the general policy of the Independent Socialists of Germany) has passed a resolution congratulating the German Social Democracy upon the brilliant and most bloodless revolution. The resolution asserts that a Socialist government has been established and welcomes the agreement between the two sections of the German Socialist movement. This is characteristic of the I. L. P.'s Menshevik policy: why not congratulate the Spartacus Socialists? Before the proletarian revolution can conquer in Germany, it must sweep aside the "unity of the sections" praised by the I. L. P.

At a conference in London a scheme for the prevention of strikes in shipyards was unanimously adopted by the Shipbuilding Employers Federation and the representatives of the trade unions concerned.

The Belgian Reaction Revealed

THE Belgian Socialist Party recently issued a manifesto in which it energetically appeals to the Belgian people not to allow the "defensive" war to develop into a war of aggression, demanding parliamentary control over the government's activity.

This sicker of independence has perhaps come too late. Belgian imperialists have just started a campaign for the annexation of "a piece of Dutch territory," the left bank of the Scheldt River.

Even the social-patriotic Socialists of Belgium should now realize that the imperialists have swindled them. They will yet be swept aside by the righteous wrath of the Belgian proletariat.

The Belgian Socialists, and others, propose an immediate convocation of an International Socialist Congress. What sort of Congress? A Congress of "international" social-patriots, such as Vandervelde, Henderson, Thomas, Scheidemann, Renaudel, Maslov, Branting and Troelstra? Or a Congress of revolutionary Socialists—Liebknecht, Lenin, Trotsky, Loriot, Lazzari, MacLenn and the active internationalists?

The Development in France

THE news that the international censorship allows to come from France concerns the "representatives of the masses" and not the masses. That there is a proletarian mass movement developing, is a certainty. The French proletariat, as well as the proletariat of Italy, is preparing for great things.

The reactionary Socialists Deputies have appealed to Premier Clemenceau for "Socialist" representation at the Peace Conference. "The Worker" has graciously promised to take the matter under consideration. Socialism has scored another victory!

The renegade Gustav Herve, editor of "La Voix du Peuple," formerly "La Guerre Sociale," has recently expelled from the party. Herve has been a violent social-patriot; his attitude was so infamous that it is not much of a credit to the party to kick him out. Now the job of cleaning up the Augean stables should begin—the expulsion of Thomas, Renaudel, Cachin, and the other traitors, who have betrayed Socialism and made the party, until recently, an ally of Imperialism.